

minds, both Architects and Presidents. Thus, Jefferson and Latrobe argued at length as to whether the column capitals in the House of Representatives chamber should be modeled after those in the Theater of Marcellus in Rome or the Choragic Monument to Lysicrates in Athens. Latrobe won; although Jefferson had the better case. This tradition had waned. Then George White renewed it.

Like his early predecessors, he is a polymath, with degrees in engineering, in business administration, and in law as well as in architecture. He is registered in and has practiced in all these fields. Beginning in 1988, I had the honor of chairing the Judiciary Office Building Commission, a body which was careful to stay out of George's way as he used his master-planning skills to propose, his legal skills to enact, his business skills to finance, and his architectural and engineering skills to design and construct what is properly judged the finest new government building in a generation, the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building at One Columbus Circle.

While the Capitol grounds and several of the buildings in the Capitol complex bear his stamp, George White has made the Capitol itself the focus of his life's work. He added balance and proportion where he found it lacking and improved what was existing when it needed his care. Who else could recognize stone shock in the West Front and repair it to a state better than before the British burned it? From the foundations of the East Steps of the House, to the Minton tiles on the floors, to the murals and frescoes on the walls—indeed, to the crown of the Statue of Freedom atop the Dome which he climbed and made new with great style and at no little peril—all is better than he found it. We perhaps do not yet understand how indebted we are! If you wanted to see his works, look about you.●

THE OCCASION OF THE 80TH BIRTHDAY OF SENATOR BILL PROXMIRE

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a long-time friend and an esteemed colleague. A true populist, his record of outstanding achievements demonstrates what is possible when the highest calibers of independence, integrity, and dedication are brought together in a loyal servant of State and country. Senator Bill Proxmire turns 80 this Saturday, and he deserves our heartfelt praise.

Senator Proxmire retired from this Chamber 7 years ago. When he did, he left it as one of the Senate's most admired Members. Every day, when he came to work after his 100 pushups and his 4-mile run, he brought with him a Puritan work ethic and a unique commitment to a set of closely held principles that set him apart from his colleagues, and will ensure that he is forever remembered as one of this Chamber's finest Senators.

His standards of personal conduct are legendary. He still holds the record for most consecutive votes in the Senate, having been in attendance for more than 10,000 rollcall votes during the course of 22 years. In his last two campaigns for the Senate, in 1976 and 1982, he refused to take campaign donations. Mr. President, let me reiterate that. Not just PAC money, not just donations above a certain amount. He did

not take any money at all, from anyone. In each of these campaigns, he spent less than \$200 all of it out of his own pocket, and most of it to pay for postage and envelopes to send back donations offered to him by his supporters. Mr. President, when Senate campaigns nowadays cost millions of dollars, this feat seems remarkable enough. The fact that, in both instances, he won by a landslide, demonstrates the peerless quality of his support and popularity among the fine people of Wisconsin.

His legislative record is equally impressive. Senator Proxmire's independence and integrity allowed him to be a strong leader on daunting issues, making progress and achieving change in areas that others might have forsaken. His battle in the late 1960's and early 1970's to kill the supersonic transport plane is the stuff of legend in the Senate. No matter what one might have thought of the merits of this program, one must admire Senator Proxmire's success in waging an uphill battle against powerful opponents to end an expensive project that he saw as a waste of the taxpayers' money.

Senator Proxmire was simultaneously a stalwart champion of both competition and the individual consumer, reminding us that the interests of the latter are so often best served by the promotion of the former. Early on in his career, he sponsored the Truth-in-Lending Act, which ensures consumer access to information in the lending market and forces banks to compete openly and on equal terms. Senator Proxmire was right when he described this landmark bill as "perhaps more valuable to the consumer than any credit card in his wallet." Later, his leadership was instrumental in securing passage of a 1980 bill deregulating the banking industry to free up financial institutions to offer better services at lower costs to consumers. He was motivated out of a profound belief that consumers would be better served by more choices. History has undeniably proven him right.

Mr. President, I had the privilege and the honor of serving on the Senate Banking Committee for part of the time that Senator Proxmire was chairman of that body. I can tell you that his independence and strength of character allowed him to perform his duties with a never-ending commitment to his role as a beneficiary of the public trust. Beholden to no one except, in his own mind, the people who elected him, he was a tireless advocate for the interests of ordinary people.

Senator Proxmire is perhaps best remembered for his near fanatical devotion to saving taxpayer dollars. He refused to travel abroad at Government expense, and he returned \$1 million to the Treasury over 6 years by cutting back on staff expenses. This commitment to personal thrift gave him the credibility to stand up to the waste of taxpayer money elsewhere in the Government. And this he did with a pas-

sion and flair for which he will always be remembered in this Chamber, partly through a device uniquely his own: the Golden Fleece awards.

Mr. President, way back in 1975, long before the Vice-President was shattering ash trays on late night television, long before people were citing \$200 Pentagon hammers, Senator Proxmire created these monthly awards to highlight particularly wasteful Government spending programs. Dozens of programs earned this dubious distinction; some have said that the Senator's zeal for exposing the waste of taxpayer dollars was matched only by the abundance of candidates from which to choose.

It seems as if everyone who's been around here a while has their own favorite Golden Fleece. Whether it's the research institution that spent \$100,000 trying to establish whether sunfish that drank tequila were more aggressive than sunfish that drank gin, the Federal Aviation Administration project to research the body measurements of airline stewardess trainees, or the grant to study why people fall in love, each Golden Fleece not only makes its point about the potential dangers of ill-managed and ill-conceived government programs, but reminds us of the humor and character of this noble public servant.

Mr. President, I hope that my colleagues will join me in conveying our best birthday wishes and our sincere thanks to Senator Bill Proxmire, who, through over 30 years of loyal service in the Senate marked by independence and hard work, demonstrated his steadfast commitment to serving the people of Wisconsin and the citizens of this Nation.●

HAZEL O'LEARY: IMAGE IS EVERYTHING

● Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, may I pose a not-so-hypothetical question? If you were head of a Government agency, and that agency were being criticized by the press, Members of Congress, and the American public for inefficiency and incompetence; if, Mr. President, you knew that the Government—at the American people's behest—was undergoing a massive effort to cut spending in order to balance the budget, what would you do, Mr. President?

If you are like most people, your answer might go something like this: I would listen carefully to the criticisms, I would take a good hard look at my department and make the necessary changes, and I would do everything possible to save money.

If, however, you are Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary, the answer is a bit different. Secretary O'Leary, whose Department of Energy is still justifying its own existence, paid \$43,500—taxpayer money, Mr. President—for a media analysis company to track her and her department's coverage in the media.

Here's how today's Wall Street Journal describes it:

Mrs. O'Leary quietly hired an investigative service to poke into the reporters who were poking around the DOE. From April through August, the service, Washington-based Carma International, tracked more than two dozen individual reporters and hundreds of newspapers, magazines and newscasts. It also pored over thousands of stories, giving each one a numerical ranking based on how favorable or unfavorable it was. It then calculated scores for how favorably or unfavorably the DOE fared on various issues, from nuclear waste to Mrs. O'Leary's own reputation. And it scrutinized sources quoted in those stories, coming up with its own "Top 25" list of "Unfavorable Sources."

Wanda Briggs and John Stang, reporters with the Tri-Cities Herald in Washington State, are among those the investigative service monitored.

Mr. President, the foolishness and irresponsibility of this venture boggles the mind. The first, most obvious point to raise is the fact that we are on a mission to balance the budget. For Secretary O'Leary to waste taxpayer dollars on her image is inexcusable. While we in Congress are trying to reduce the size and cost of Government so that we may achieve a balanced budget in 7 years, a member of the President's Cabinet feels free to throw money into frivolous projects.

Oh, and by the way, the Wall Street Journal quotes Secretary O'Leary's spokeswoman as saying that the investigative service "wasn't particularly useful," and that the Secretary read very little of what the service had to offer since "she found it too complicated." I think it's time the Secretary understood that we can neither afford, nor will we allow, \$43,000 mistakes.

Second, Mr. President, of all the various responsibilities of the DOE—and they are serious responsibilities indeed—using a private company to analyze Secretary O'Leary's image in the press is, to put it mildly, at the very bottom of the list.

The challenges facing DOE in Washington State alone are stupendous:

At the Hanford Nuclear Site, thousands of tons of nuclear waste lie underground, yards away from the Columbia River, posing a direct threat to the region's safety.

Cleanup at Hanford, while progressing, still demands our utmost attention and concern. The health of the people of the Hanford region, and of the people all over the country who live near nuclear sites, requires that we remain fully committed to cleaning up the nuclear waste.

That is just in my home State, Mr. President. Across the country, similar problems exist. So it is disturbing to learn that Secretary O'Leary's attention is being diverted by such trivial concerns as what the press is saying about her.

Mr. President, over the last 18 months, almost 5,000 people have lost their jobs at Hanford. They are struggling and will continue to struggle

with upheaval and uncertainty in their community. Meanwhile, the Secretary of Energy, someone who has potentially great influence over their fate, pulls a stunt like this. So much for setting an example at the top.

There are a lot of people in this town for whom \$43,500 is nothing—less than nothing. In the White House, in Congress, in the agencies, people deal on a daily basis with money in the millions and billions. But Mr. President, for the people of Hanford, that's real money.

There is a man in the Hanford area who lost his job more than 6 months ago. He has talked with my office, and prefers to remain anonymous. For 15 years he worked at Westinghouse as a technologist. He paid his taxes, he was a Boy Scout, he provided for his family. He was laid off on April 28—in the same month that Secretary O'Leary began her quest for a better image. He has two children and two grandchildren. His wife recently had to quit her job due to illness. He is still looking for work.

Coincidentally, Mr. President, this man's salary—before he was laid off—was \$44,000. Secretary O'Leary spent over \$43,000 for 4 months of useless media analysis. Food on the table, or image enhancement—Mr. President, just where do Hazel O'Leary's priorities lie?●

THE ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise to lament the fact that House Joint Resolution 115 contains a provision to provide for the "orderly termination" of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations [ACIR]. This is most regrettable, and ought not to go unnoticed.

The ACIR was created by Congress in 1959—during the Eisenhower administration—"to monitor the operation of the American federal system and to recommend improvements." The commission is independent and bipartisan. Over 30 years ago, under Dr. Alice Rivlin, it commenced ground-breaking research on alternative measures of fiscal capacity. It measures tax effort and representative expenditures and a host of other topics that may appear arcane, but are of enormous importance when it comes to governance. Few people are even aware of the ACIR because it goes about its business quietly, professionally, and dispassionately.

Earlier this year, Mr. President, Congress passed the unfunded mandates bill—Public Law 104-4. That bill generated considerable discussion about our Federal system and the proper roles of and relationships between the various levels of government. At that time, the Commission's unique expertise on such questions was recognized, and Congress delegated much work regarding unfunded mandates to it. The Commission estimated it would need about \$1 million over and above its fiscal year 1995 appropriation of \$1 mil-

lion to perform the unfunded mandates work and continue equally valuable ongoing research and projects.

Earlier this year, the House Treasury-Postal appropriations bill (H.R. 2020) zeroed out funding for the Commission. The Senate bill provided \$334,000 for the Commission, but stipulated that no further Federal funds would be made available.

This seems to me a good example of an unfunded mandate. But no matter. The ACIR is prepared to continue its operations without Federal funding. I do not know how, but I leave it to them. When conferees met on the Treasury-Postal bill, however, language was inserted that would give ACIR a small appropriation to terminate its operations by April of 1996. Senate Joint Resolution 115 also provides a minimum amount of funding "necessary to accomplish orderly termination" of the Commission. Both the Commission and the Office of Management and Budget [OMB] are concerned that termination is something altogether different from simply not providing Federal funding.

I deeply regret the action of the Treasury-Postal conferees, and I deeply regret that it has carried over to the continuing resolution. Is it necessary to terminate an organization that has indicated it can survive, somehow, without Federal funds?

Mr. President, the first principle of public affairs is that you never do anything about a problem until you learn to measure it. I would add a corollary: if your purpose is not to address problems through government, you will put an end to attempts to measure them. I wonder if that is what is at work here. Surely, we are not going to balance the budget by eliminating the ACIR. What is this all about?

I remember back in December 1981, Edwin Harper, then deputy director of the OMB, issued a memorandum which stated:

As a result of recent evaluations of certain reporting requirements, it has been decided to discontinue the compilation and publication of the "Geographic Distribution of Federal Funds," effective immediately. Data should not be submitted for fiscal year 1981.

The purpose of that directive was to make it more difficult to quantify the balance of payments between the States and the Federal Government.

Beginning in 1968, the Community Services Administration began to publish annual reports, known as the Geographic Distribution of Federal Funds series, in which expenditures of various Federal programs were broken down by State, and thereafter by counties and towns. It is worth noting that the Community Services Administration was the successor to the Office of Economic Opportunity, the organization established in 1965 to carry out President Johnson's "War on Poverty." As a member of the President's task force that drew up that legislation, I had been much concerned with the question of regional balance in Federal expenditures and, in 1965, made what I believe